27902. Adulteration and misbranding of Four Salicylates Compound. U. S. v. Jenkins Laboratories, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $60. (F. & D. No. 33910. Sample No. 48522–A.)

This product contained less than one-third of the amount of salicylates represented upon its label. The labeling also bore false and fraudulent curative or therapeutic claims.

On June 3, 1935, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Jenkins Laboratories, Inc., Auburn, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about June 15, 1933, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania of a quantity of Four Salicylates Compound which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis showed that the article contained per tablet not more than 1.64 grains of salicylic acid, less than one-third of the total salicylates represented on the label, not more than 0.116 grain of sodium salicylate, not more than 1.14 grains of magnesium salicylate, and not more than 1 grain of strontium salicylate.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, since the tablets contained less than one-third of the amount of salicylates represented upon the label.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Four Salicylates Co. Acid Salicylic Sodium Carbonate aa 1 gr. Sodium Salicylate 2 grs. Magnesium Salicylate 2 grs. Strontium Salicylate 2 grs. * * * tablets," borne on the bottle label, were false and misleading in that they represented that each of the tablets contained 1 grain of salicylic acid and 2 grains each of sodium salicylate, magnesium salicylate, and strontium salicylate; whereas the tablets contained less salicylic acid, sodium salicylate, magnesium salicylate, and strontium salicylate than declared.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that statements on the bottle label, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as an anti-rheumatic and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for rheumatism and ailments due to rheumatism.

On January 7, 1938, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of $60.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27903. Misbranding of Dr. Jacob Becker's Eye Balsam. U. S. v. W. M. Olliffe, Inc. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 34000. Sample No. 14826–B.)

The labeling of this product contained false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects.

On June 11, 1937, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against W. M. Olliffe, Inc., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about June 12, 1934, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania of a quantity of Dr. Jacob Becker's Eye Balsam which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Prepared by W. M. Olliffe * * * New York City."

Analysis showed that it consisted of a mixture of fat, sand, mercury, and mercuric oxide.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements on the jar and carton and in a circular shipped with it falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a relief, treatment, remedy, and cure for granulated eyelids, klieg eye, stys, pinkeye, sore, weak or inflamed eyes, and eye trouble.

On October 8, 1937, a plea of nolo contendere was entered on behalf of the defendant and the court imposed a fine of $25.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27904. Misbranding of Hem-Roid. U. S. v. Dr. Leonhardt Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $200. (F. & D. No. 37026. Sample Nos. 45577–B, 52210–B.)

The labeling of this product contained false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects.

On June 29, 1936, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Dr. Leonhardt Co., a corporation, Buffalo,